Overview

This collaborative research titled "Study of Arms and Armor in Middle-Period Tumuli : An Initial Research Based on Artifacts from the *Marozuka* Tomb" formally began in 2004 but, as explained in Part 1, preparations began prior to that, in 2002. Accordingly, some ten years have gone into the completion of this book. The results of this collaborative research are presented here in Parts Two through Five. Part Two is a report on artifacts unearthed from the *Marozuka* Tomb in Kumamoto, Japan, held by the National Museum of Japanese History (NMJH), and was the impetus for beginning this collaborative research. Part Three reports on some of the findings regarding artifacts unearthed from the *Shichikan* Tomb in Osaka in 1913, held by NMJH and the Osaka Castle Museum. Part Four consists of research reports on relevant data selected according to the interests of each of the participants in this collaborative research. Part Five provides listings of both middle period armor and documentary materials to show the present state of Kofun Period armor research and future trends.

In the following, after touching on several of the arguments of Parts Four and Five, I (Sugii Takeshi) will provide some observations and thoughts from during the progress of this collaborative research as an overview.

In Chapter One of Part Four, the manufacturing technology of the *obigane-shiki* (laminar) armor discussed by Furuya Takeshi forms the core of the results of the present collaborative research. Because the armor unearthed at the *Marozuka* Tomb is unique in its excellent state of preservation, a wide range of information can be drawn from it. However, if that information cannot be reported appropriately and systematically, the volume of information can conversely be damaging, and there is the danger that the intended content may not be transmitted satisfactorily. Thereupon Furuya has expanded the arguments [Furuya 1996] he had been advancing over some time regarding the armor manufacturing process, organizing his findings into a four-stage manufacturing process and twelve observations regarding manufacturing techniques and technology. The outline of this is presented in No. 2 of Section One, Chapter Three, Part Two. Furuya does not simply conclude his article with a detailed discussion of that content, but instead goes on to attempt a systemization of Kofun Period metallurgical techniques with reference to modern concepts of technological categories, and his work will certainly prove to be a milestone in future research of this kind.

Chapters Two through Four of Part Four take up the topic of the armor itself. All of them are based on a typological discussion of armor unearthed from the *Marozuka* Tomb, but in different areas of interest. Nishijima Takahiro's article in Chapter Two provides detailed observations of *byōdome* (riveted) *tankō* armor excavated in Kumamoto, and considers the positioning of those findings relative

to the *tankō* unearthed from the *Marozuka* Tomb, and also the background to the large number of *tankō* found in that region. There are a large number of unreported excavated materials from the Kumamoto region, and armor is no exception. The greatest merit of this article is its attempt to rectify that situation through painstaking investigation. As a result, he has provided a measurement of the *tankō* found from the Denzayama Tomb in Tamana City, and expanded illustrations of the *tankō* found from Wabu Uenoharu Tomb No. 4 in Kōshi City and Kaminohana Tomb No. 3 in Kamiamakusa City. Because there are unknown details regarding a number of other armors from the Kumamoto region, including the *tankō* from the Takatsuka tunneled tombs in Takamori-machi and the helmet, *akabeyoroi* (gorget) from the Denzayama Tomb, and so forth, future studies including these are highly anticipated. In Hashimoto Tatsuya's article in Chapter Three, he studies the structural features of two *mabisashi-tsuki* (visored) helmets found at the *Marozuka* Tomb, placing them in the TK216 type (one of the type of Sue stoneware form Suemura kilns in Osaka) stage (the second quarter of fifth century), and goes on to consider the features and attributes of *mabisashi-tsuki* helmets and the lineages of the various parts including the visor, helmet bowl and pipe, bowl rest, etc. As a result, these *mabisashi-tsuki* helmets were interpreted as ceremonial helmets combining the technology of Silla linked to that of San-Yan, and incorporating the design of Baekje with symbolism related to the royal authority of the Japanese archipelago, in other words as including aspects of a crown. If this conclusion is accepted, then we may conjecture that the next stage would be an examination of how other armor including *shōkaku-tsuki* (beaked) helmets are different from or the same as these. In Suzuki Kazunao's article in Chapter Four, he divided the manufacturing stages into three, based on an examination of the attributes of the transitional trends in the *kozane byōdome shōkaku-tsuki* (lamellar riveted and beaked) helmet and co-occurring artifacts. The first stage was the old style III stage (using the upper attachment method for the beak), the second was the new style III stage, and for the third, added to the newest style III stage, were the stages of the IVa style (internally attached twisted style), IVb (internally attached cut style), Va style (externally attached twisted style), each seen as parallel to the TK73, TK216–ON46, and TK208–TK23 type stages (the first three quarters of the fifth century). The *shōkaku-tsuki* helmet from the *Marozuka* Tomb was positioned within the transitional period between the second and third stages. In order to examine a cross-section of all *byōdome* (riveted) helmets including the *yokohagi-ita byōdome shōkaku-tsuki* (horizontal plated and riveted beaked) helmet, Suzuki presents an analytical point of view, as he mentions in his article.

Suzuki Kazunao's article of Chapter Five focuses on the distinctive features seen in the artifacts from the *Marozuka* Tomb. This article takes up the straight line pattern engraved on the two *keitō* (jade *gui*-tablet shaped) *yajiri* arrowheads from the *Marozuka* Tomb, and also considers the circular patterns as well. The engraved iron arrowheads with straight line patterns originate from the openwork iron arrowheads known from late-Yayoi period northern Kyushu. In the middle Kofun Period these

had a distribution centered around the area of Miyazaki, and are understood to symbolize the local string belts. On the other hand, engraved iron arrowheads with circular patterns exist not only from the middle Kofun Period but also from the early period, and are widely distributed throughout the archipelago of western Japan. Therefore, although there are both types of engraved iron arrowheads, those with straight line patterns are thought to be different in character. The circular patterns are conjectured to have been a magical pattern to enhance the sacred or evil-suppressing power of arms and armor. Engraved iron arrowheads with straight line patterns have thus far been known to exist in quantity in the Miyazaki prefectural region, but it is important to note that the *Marozuka* Tomb examples show them to have had a distribution in Kumamoto as well.

In Chapter Six, Ueno Yoshifumi addresses and actively pursues the possibility that prestige goods distributed to local areas by the central governing authority (royal authority) in the Kinki region were kept (or, retained) in each locale for a fixed period of time. Discussed in this article is the co-occurring relationship of mirrors and armor, which shows that *obigane kawatoji-shiki* (leather-laced laminar) armor is often found in funerary burial sites together with mirrors whose manufacture predates that of the armor (mirrors retained in the local area, or retained mirrors), while on the other hand, *obigane byōdome-shiki* (riveted laminar) armor and *kozane* (lamellar) armor are often found in funerary burial sites with mirrors whose manufacture is contemporaneous to that of the armor (with no passage of time after acquisition, or acquired mirrors). Furthermore, an examination was made of the co-occurrence with armor of *sankaku-buchi shinjū kyō* (triangular-rimmed mirror decorated with gods and animals), revealing that in the case of funerary burial of *obigane kawatoji-shiki* armor, the funerary burial of retained mirrors was particularly in evidence. In other words, when considering in general such prestige goods as mirrors and armor, there is a tendency to look at them from the point of view of the royal authority, but it was shown that in reality the act of burying prestige goods in a tomb largely reflects local ways of thinking. This point may prove extremely significant when considering the structure of political authority in the Kofun Period, or the relationship between the center of authority and the local regions.

Chapters Seven and Eight principally analyze tendencies in tombs in the Kumamoto area. Takaki Kyōji's article of Chapter Seven focuses, within the Kumamoto area, on the Kikuchi River watershed where the *Marozuka* Tomb is located, and considers not only the graves of headmen but also medium- and small-sized circular tumuli, tunneled graves, and stone coffins lacking tumuli. This article will without doubt prove to be fundamental to future studies of the tombs in this area. In the Kikuchi River watershed during the Kofun Period, boat-shaped coffins were made in quantity and many stone chambers were decorated with pigment. Takaki thought that cause the existence of a major land route passing through this region. In Chapter Eight, Sugii Takeshi points out that in the middle part of the mid-Kofun Period, interior routes following the rivers were seen as of greater importance than the

coastal route along the Ariake Sea, and he considers there being a high likelihood that the central political authority that had constructed the Furuichi and Mozu tomb groups was closely involved in the maintenance of those routes. The most likely candidate for the location of the *Marozuka* Tomb is the plateau on the left bank of the western half of the mid-Kōshi River, which is a tributary of the Kikuchi River. This area is of the greatest importance in the interior route linking the Kikka basin, in the Kikuchi River watershed, with the Kumamoto plains in the south, and the large amount of arms and armor collected in the *Marozuka* Tomb is taken to be for that reason. Based on the content of this article, the author has analyzed in a separate article [Sugii 2010] the lineage tendencies in headman graves for the entire Kumamoto area.

The listing of middle period armor and of documentary materials in Part Five is intended to contribute to future research on Kofun Period armor, and has been gathered primarily by Hashimoto Tatsuya. A history of the research literature about Kofun Period armor has been concisely arranged by Hashimoto, which should prove to be of effective use in the future.

The existence of the artifacts from the *Marozuka* Tomb in Kumamoto was first made public in 1968. The artifacts of the *Shichikan* Tomb in Osaka introduced by Suenaga Masao in 1933 had been discovered in 1913. Forty-five years have passed since the former discovery, and a century since the latter. The ordering, researching, and reporting on such previously excavated materials requires an unimaginable degree of effort and patience. Moreover, the task is neither colorful nor dramatic. When the materials are not those that the researcher personally unearthed and discovered, maintaining the will and enthusiasm to continue the various long-term tasks is no simple matter. Nevertheless, the planning of such work, and engaging in it, is of the highest importance today.

First, and this is so obvious that it hardly deserves mentioning, it is important that unreported archaeological materials be formally reported and preparations for sharing the materials be made. Further, it is important that previously reported materials also be investigated and analyzed from the contemporary point of view. In Kumamoto, the area I am most familiar with, there is a great number of unreported archaeological materials. For example, among the six keyhole-shaped tumuli over 100m in length in Kumamoto—Inariyama Tomb in Tamana City, Iwabaru Futagozuka Tomb in Yamaga City, Nagamezuka Tomb in Aso City, Tenjinyama Tomb in Uto City, and Nakanojō Tomb and Ōnoiwaya Tomb in Hikawa-chō, Yatsushiro County—the artifacts from the first three still remain formally unreported. There are many tumuli, such as the Kunigoshi Tomb in Uki City that is comprising the chronological core of late period tumuli in the area, where excavations have been carried out but the results have not sufficiently been made public. Under such conditions, the study of lineage tendencies in headman graves, which is one of the major issues in tumulus research, is accompanied by many problems, and it is very difficult for another person to verify the results of that research. The artifacts

of the *Marozuka* Tomb are among those that remain unreported. Since these materials are thought to be indispensible for the study of the middle Kofun Period, not only in Kumamoto but throughout the Japanese archipelago, through producing written reports we believe that a new wind may blow through the field of Kumamoto archaeology.

Facing a time when many of the baby-boomer generation working in cultural asset administration are starting to retire, and as many of the leaders who supported post-WWII Japanese archaeology pass away, the necessity to pass on their reports to the younger generation is increasing. Further, because of the worsening of economic conditions, it has been a long time since any change has been sought in buried cultural assets administration, which was focused on the rushed excavations and studies required by the former development [Iwamoto 2004]. Accordingly, today we have a good opportunity to re-examine the various accumulated excavated artifacts and to carefully consider how to make use of them. The work of ordering, researching, and reporting on unreported materials, from the aspects of the multi-generational transmission of information and the usage of excavated materials, will without a doubt become in the future an important field in buried cultural assets administration.

Noteworthy among the trends in recent years in Kumamoto has been the ordering and reporting on the as-yet unreported artifacts excavated in 1966 from Todoroki Shell Mound in Uto City [Fujimoto, ed. 2008], and the re-examination and reporting on the artifacts, including unreported artifacts, from Eta Funayama Tomb in Nagomi-machi, Tamana County [Nishida, ed. 2007].

Can these sorts of activities, focused on local government, develop relationships with museums and universities? Or, as individual activities, what can we accomplish?

Although I have no experience of working for a museum, as the representative of this collaborative research I felt that (and this too is completely obvious) for a museum, the collection of materials and their study and research, and the public dissemination of those materials and the results of the research through exhibits, along with providing a concretization of history, are extremely important. In this collaborative research we went no further than study and research, but in the future the public dissemination of those results will be called for. Furthermore, when planning work to bring to light materials that have been stored away, the role of the museum is, from the point of view of initiating collaborative research with the involvement of local governments and universities, considerably large. No matter how small a local museum may be, the role expected of it will never be minor.

How universities, especially regional universities like Kumamoto University, interact with local cultural assets administration is a most important issue. As with the role played by museums, universities should play a central role in the collaborative study and research organs that are set up with local governments. However, more important than that is work to improve human resources. In terms of archaeology, this means training personnel capable of taking the long term view regarding

the correct examination of archaeological materials, their study, research, appropriate terminology, the use of proper Japanese expressions, the meaning of studying archaeology, and the meaning of protecting cultural assets for future generations. Doing that will indeed constitute one of the greatest contributions to local cultural assets administration. Accordingly, it is extremely important for universities to be actively involved in the processes of arranging, studying, and reporting on unreported local materials. The stimulus that students involved in such work will receive from local government or persons involved in archaeology is immeasurable. In the present collaborative research we had the involvement of several students, and it is keenly hoped that they will be active in their respective fields.

One of the greatest strengths of Japanese archaeology I feel is the stance of attempting to extract as much information as possible through detailed studies of archaeological materials and their analysis. On the one hand, this is often ridiculed as the study of artifacts simply for the sake of studying the artifacts at the expense, it is pointed out, of theory [Tsude 1995]. However, without reliable information derived from reliable artifacts, and without the sharing of such materials and information, nothing can begin. I believe that the root of archaeological study and research indeed lies in a penetrating examination of archaeological artifacts. The present collaborative research has pursued such practice. The next question will be how the collaborators in this research can, each in their own way, apply the results and the experience gained through this collaborative research.

By way of a conclusion, I believe that at the root of the humanities field, inclusive of archaeology, is a deliberation of the nature of humanity or humankind. In that sense, the work of popularizing this information obtained through a thoroughgoing examination of archaeological materials, and even sublimating it into human history, is extremely important. After having experienced the events of 11 March 2011, I feel even more strongly today about what it means to study the humanities.